

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

JUAN MATA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MAXEY CERLIANO, et al.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:23-cv-484-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Juan Mata, a former Gregg County Jail inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On April 19, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss this case with prejudice as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Docket No. 9. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff at his last-known address but was returned as undeliverable. Docket No. 10. Plaintiff has not filed objections or otherwise communicated with the Court, including to update his address, since filing his complaint in September 2023.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court


examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 9) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**So ordered and signed on this**

**Aug 15, 2024**

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE